

PATENT**HP Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Serial No. 10/697,688****REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-24 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30 are independent.

Claims 1-10, 12-21, and 25-34 were rejected under U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-21 and 23-34 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adler et al. (6,138,130) in view of Hsiung et al. (20030144746).

Telephonic Interviews Conducted on November 9, 13, and 14, 2006

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended in the various telephonic interviews. Proposed amendment to independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30 were discussed in light of statutory subject matter and the references of record. Regarding statutory subject matter, the undersigned thanks the Examiner for providing suggested language in the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. Regarding the prior art rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner indicated that further review is needed upon the filing of an RCE.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-10, 12-21, and 25-34 were rejected under U.S.C. §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 1 and 30 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner during the telephonic interviews. Independent claims 9, 17, and

PATENT**HP Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Serial No. 10/697,688**

25 have been amended with similar language to that found in the amended claims 1 and 30 to show useful, concrete and tangible results. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The test for determining if a claim is rendered obvious by one or more references for purposes of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is set forth in MPEP § 706.02(j):

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Therefore, if the above-identified criteria are not met, then the cited reference(s) fails to render obvious the claimed invention and, thus, the claimed invention is distinguishable over the cited reference(s).

Claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Adler et al. (6,138,130) in view of Hsiung et al. (20030144746).

As admitted in the final Office Action, Adler et al. fails to disclose "determining a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data based on the determined geographical location of the data source," as recited in independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30. It is respectfully submitted that Hsiung et al. cannot make up for such a deficiency, as alleged in the final Office Action, simply because Hsiung et al. also fails to

PATENT

HP Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Serial No. 10/697,688

disclose the aforementioned features. Specifically, as cited in the final Office Action, Hsiung et al. merely states in paragraph [0365] that,

Model Builders may also select the source of the training data. Training data can come from a real-time data server, a historical data server, or from a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Model Builders may specify the location of the training data for each sensor or model that is used as input to the model. If training data is being imported from an Excel spreadsheet, data fields from the spreadsheet may be mapped to the appropriate sensor. A function may be provided which enables the Model Builder to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet.

Thus, the Model Builders may specify the location of the training data, e.g., as imported from an Excel spreadsheet, for each sensor by mapping such data from the spreadsheet to the appropriate sensor. In contrast, independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, “determining [or identifying] a geographical location of the data source [or sensor]” and

determining [or designating] a location in an electronic spreadsheet for placing at least a portion of the data *based on the determined geographical location of the data source*; (emphasis added).

Consequently, as claimed, a display of the data portion at the determined location in the spreadsheet provides indication of the geographical location of the data source. In other words, these claims recite a mapping *from* a geographical location of the data source *to* a location in a spreadsheet *based on* the *geographical location* of the data source. This claimed mapping is not only in reverse to the data mapping in Hsiung et al. (which involves mapping of training data from a spreadsheet to import into the sensors), it is also done based on the determined geographical location of the data source (which Hsiung et al. completely disregards and does not factor into its *reversed* data mapping).

Although Hsiung et al. states that “a function may be provided which enables the Model Builder to associate a sensor with a column of data in the spreadsheet,” this association is only done *after* the data has been placed in the spreadsheet, and not *before* so

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****NOV 15 2006****PATENT**HIP Docket No.: 200313958-1
App. Serial No. 10/697,688

that such data is placed at a particular location in the spreadsheet to indicate the geographical location of the sensor.

Because the combination of Adler et al. and Hsiung et al. fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the pending independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25 and 30, withdrawal of the rejection of all pending claims 1-3, 5-21, and 23-34 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 15, 2006

By


Tiep H. Nguyen
Registration No.: 44,465Ashok K. Mannava
Registration No.: 45,301MANNAVA & KANG, P.C.
8221 Old Courthouse Road
Suite 104
Vienna, VA 22182
(703) 652-3819 (or 3822)
(703) 865-5150 (facsimile)